



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/991,620	11/05/2001	Hideki Tanaka	B588-025	4702

26272 7590 02/21/2006

COWAN LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN P.C.
JOHN J TORRENTE
1133 AVE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 10036

EXAMINER

FISCHETTI, JOSEPH A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/991,620

Applicant(s)

TANAKA, HIDEKI

Examiner

Joseph A. Fischetti

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-15 and 17-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5,8,10,12-14,19,20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,6,7,15,17 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,3,6,7,9,15,17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Peachey-Kountz et al. Peachey-kountz teach an order acceptance management apparatus for assigning a rank to an orderer and implementing acceptance of an order for a commodity in accordance with rank assigned to the orderer (see abstract) comprising:

delivery-schedule acquisition means for acquiring information concerning a delivery schedule of a commodity and means for deciding a delivery date (see col. 9, lines 52-62). Peachey-Kountz et al also teach the step of notifying the computer of whether the order will be accepted (see, for example, col. 10, lines 53-61); inventory acquisition means for acquiring information concerning number of units of the commodity in stock from storage means in which the number of units of commodity in stock has been stored upon being allocated to a number of groups corresponding to a number of ranks (see col. 4, lines 45-55).

Peachy-Kountz also disclose:

if the allocated number of units of the commodity in stock that belongs to a

Art Unit: 3627

first group corresponding to a first rank assigned to the orderer is not less than the number of units of the commodity in the issued order, said determination means determines that the issued order is accepted and the allocated number of units of the commodity in stock stored in the storage means that belongs to said first group is replaced with a number that is difference value between the allocated number of units of the commodity in stock that belongs to the first group and the number of units of the commodity of the issued order, see Peachy Kountz: "In a preferred embodiment system, the new order is netted out from supply identified for the customer, first from currently available supply, supply for the current and, then, prior periods. If more supply is still required, other..." col. 11.

if the allocated number of units of the commodity that belongs to the first group corresponding to the first rank assigned to the order is less than the number of units of the commodity in the issued order, said determination means determines that the issued order is not accepted and determines whether there is an allocated number of units of the commodity in stock that belongs to a second group corresponding to a second rank lower than the first rank see Peachy Kountz col. 11:

If more supply is still required, other customers' currently available supply is used to fill the order, i.e., from other customers with the same or lower priority. If, however, it is determined in step 154 that current supply is insufficient to meet the order, then, in step 156, the supply available to fill the order is supplemented from other, lower tier, forecast groups currently available supply. So, after determining that supply, previously designated for other forecast groups of the

Art Unit: 3627

same or lower priority is currently available, that previously designated supply is made available and allocated, as needed, according to steps 144-154.

Regarding the newly added limitations of allocation decision means for deciding an allocation ratio for each of groups corresponding to a number of ranks the inventory acquisition means, the allocation decision means is read as the demand configurator 82 which is responsible for deciding the rations shown in Fig. 3, e.g. rations are numbers with the denominator of one. Regarding the limitation added to the inventory acquisition means, applicant is referred to col. 5 lines 1-35 wherein the acquisition means is disclosed with respect to Groups 1 and 2 as having a PROFIT ATP and the PROFIT ATP is responsible for the ratio table of Fig. 3, and hence drives the acquisition means discussed on col. 4 lines 45-55.

However, the system in Peachy-Kountz does not have a determining means/step for determining whether an order can be accepted if the order has issued. However, Walker et al. '534 disclose col. 19 lines 6-15 a determining means which compares a CPO (order) against a set of rule and based upon this comparison either accepts or rejects an issued CPO. It would be obvious to modify the system/method of Peachy-Kountz to include the up/down determining means of Walker et al because the motivation would be the preservation of inventory not otherwise available to the orderer. *The up or down determination means modification to Peachy-Kountz et al. would not upset the teaching in Peachy-Kountz of thereafter determining if the second tier can supply the source as set forth above. Since, Peachy-Kountz et al discloses going to the secondary source even if the primary can be full-filled in part, it is deemed to be a matter of*

degree whether the threshold is in part or all or nothing. Official notice is taken regarding this practice.

Regarding the limitations of:

Re claim 3, 17: see col. 4 lines 45-55 of Peachy.

Re claim 6: the computer connection is the communication channel of Peachy.

RE claim 7: Walker et al. has means for notifying as elements 200 (same motivation repeated).

RE claim 9: server 200 of Peachy inherently has a storage means.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peachy-Kountz and Walker et al. as applied above, and further in view of Haung.

The above referenced combination fails to teach ranking based on performance, but Haung et al does disclose a performance based supply system see col. 95. It would be obvious to modify Peachy-Kountz to include the performance based supply feature the Haung et al. the motivation being getting supply to the most needy.

Application/Control Number: 09/991,620

Page 6

Art Unit: 3627

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Joseph A. Fischetti at
telephone number ^{(571) 272 6780} ~~(703) 305-0731~~.


JOSEPH A. FISCHETTI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Joseph A. Fischetti
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3627